arXiv:1201.5567v4 [math-ph] 8 Apr 2012

SHARP ESTIMATES FOR TURBULENCE IN WHITE-FORCED GENERALISED BURGERS EQUATION.

ALEXANDRE BORITCHEV

Centre de Mathematiques Laurent Schwartz,
Ecole Polytechnique, Route de Saclay
91128 Palaiseau Cedex, France.
E-mail: boritchev@math.polytechnique.fr

Abstract. We consider a non-homogeneous generalised Burgers equation

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t}+f'(u)\frac{\partial u}{\partial x}-\nu\frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2}=\eta,\ t\geq 0,\ x\in S^1.$$

Here f is strongly convex, ν is small and positive, while η is a random forcing term, smooth in space and white in time.

For any solution u of this equation we consider the quasi-stationary regime, corresponding to $t\geq T_1$, where T_1 depends only on f and on the distribution of η. We obtain sharp upper and lower bounds for Sobolev norms of u averaged in time and in ensemble. These results yield sharp upper and lower bounds for natural analogues of quantities characterising the hydrodynamical turbulence. All our bounds do not depend on the initial condition, and hold uniformly in ν.

Estimates similar to some of our results have been obtained by Aurell, Frisch, Lutsko, and Vergassola on a physical level of rigour; we use some arguments from their article.

Contents

Introduction 2
1. Notation and Setup 4
1.1. Sobolev Spaces 4
1.2. Random Setting 5
1.3. Preliminaries 6
1.4. Agreements 7
2. Formulation of the Main Results 8
3. Upper Estimates for Sobolev Norms 10
4. Lower Estimates for Sobolev Norms 16

5. Sobolev Norms: Main Theorem 20
6. Estimates for Small-Scale Quantities 21
6.1. Agreements and Notation 21
6.2. Results in Physical Space 22
6.3. Results in Fourier Space 28
7. Stationary Measure and Related Issues 31
Acknowledgements 32
References 32

Introduction

The generalised one-dimensional space-periodic Burgers equation

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + f'(u)\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} - \nu \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} = 0, \quad \nu > 0,\ x \in S^1 = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z} \tag{1}$$

(the classical Burgers equation [7] corresponds to $f(u) = u^2/2$) is a popular model for the Navier-Stokes equation, since both of them have similar nonlinearities and dissipative terms. For $\nu \ll 1$ and f strongly convex, i.e. satisfying:

$$f''(x) \geq \sigma > 0, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{2}$$

solutions of (1) display turbulent-like behaviour, called "Burgulence" [3, 4]. In this paper, we are interested in qualitative and quantitative properties of the Burgulence.

To simplify presentation, we restrict ourselves to solutions with zero mean value in space:

$$\int_{S^1} u(t,x)dx = 0, \quad \forall t \geq 0. \tag{3}$$

Accordingly, we assume that the initial value $u(0,\cdot)$ satisfies (3).

In [5], Biryuk considered (1) with f satisfying (2). He studied norms in space of solutions u for small values of ν and obtained the following estimates for L_2 norms of the m-th derivatives:

$$\|u(t)\|_m^2 \leq C\nu^{-(2m-1)},\ \frac{1}{T}\int_0^T \|u(t)\|_m^2 \geq c\nu^{-(2m-1)}, \quad m \geq 1,\ \nu \leq \nu_0.$$

Note that the exponents for ν in lower and upper bounds are the same. The constants ν_0, C, c, and T depend on the deterministic initial condition u_0 as well as on m. To get results independent of the initial data, a natural idea is to introduce random forcing and to estimate ensemble-averaged characteristics of solutions. In the previous article [6], we have considered the case when 0 in the right-hand side of (1) is replaced by a random spatially smooth force, "kicked" in time. In this article we consider

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial t} + f'(u)\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} - \nu \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x^2} = \eta^\omega, \tag{4}$$

where η^ω is a random force, white in time and smooth in space. This force corresponds, heuristically, to a scaled limit of "kicked" forces with more and more frequent kicks. All forces that we consider satisfy (3).

Study of Sobolev norms of solutions for nonlinear PDEs with small viscosity (with or without random forcing) is motivated by the problem of turbulence. This research was initiated by Kuksin, who obtained lower and upper estimates of these norms by negative powers of the viscosity for a large class of equations (see [20, 21] and references in [21]), and continued by Biryuk [5]. We use some methods and ideas from those works. Note that for the Burgers equation considered in [5, 6] and in our work, estimates on Sobolev norms are asymptotically sharp in the sense that viscosity enters lower and upper bounds at the same negative power. Such estimates are not available for the more complicated equations considered in [20, 21].

In this work, after introducing the notation and setup in Section 1, we formulate the main results in Section 2. In Section 3, for $t \geq 1$, we estimate from above the moments of $\max \partial u/\partial x$ for solutions $u(t,x)$ of (4). Using these bounds, in Sections 3-5 we obtain estimates of the same type as in [5, 6], valid for time $t \geq T_1 = T_0 + 2$. Here, T_0 is a constant, independent of the initial condition and of ν. Actually, for $t \geq T_1$, we are in a quasi-stationary regime: all estimates hold uniformly in t, ν, and in the intial condition u_0.

In Section 6 we study implications of our results in terms of the theory of Burgulence. Namely, we give sharp upper and lower bounds for the dissipation length scale, increments, flatness, and spectral asymptotics for the flow $u(t,x)$. These bounds hold uniformly for $\nu \leq \nu_0$, where ν_0 is a constant which is independent of the initial condition.

The results of Section 6 rigorously justify the predictions for space increments of solutions $u(t,x)$ and for their spectral asymptotics made in [2, 12, 17, 18]; see also [8]. One proof in this section uses some constructions and arguments from [2]. Note that predictions for spectral asymptotics have been known since the 1950s: in [18], the author refers to some earlier results by Burgers and Tatsumi.

The rigorous proof of the asymptotics predicted by a physical argument, even for such a relatively simple model as the stochastic Burgers equation, is important since for the 3D or 2D incompressible Navier-Stokes equations there is no exact theory of this type, corresponding to the heuristic theories due to Kolmogorov and Kraichnan.

The stochastic Burgers equation admits a unique stationary measure μ. Estimates in Sections 3-6 still hold if we replace averaging in time and probability with averaging with respect to μ. Moreover, the rate of convergence to μ in L_1 does not depend on the viscosity. We will give details of the proof in a future publication.

We are concerned with solutions for (4) with small but positive ν. For a detailed study of the limiting dynamics with $\nu = 0$, see [13]. Additional properties for both cases $\nu = 0$ and $\nu > 0$ have been established in [15, 16].

The results of Sections 6-7 also hold in the case of a "kicked" force, since we have estimates analogous to those in Sections 3-5 (see [6]). Finally, we would like to note that similar estimates hold in the case of the multidimensional potential randomly forced Burgers equation (see [4] for physical predictions). Those estimates will be the subject of a future publication.

1. Notation and Setup

Agreement: In the whole paper, all functions that we consider are real-valued.

1.1. Sobolev Spaces.

Consider a zero mean value integrable function v on S^1. For $p \in [1, \infty]$, we denote its L_p norm by $|v|_p$. The L_2 norm is denoted by $|v|$, and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ stands for the L_2 scalar product. From now on L_p, $p \in [1, \infty]$, denotes the space of zero mean value functions in $L_p(S^1)$. Similarly, C^∞ is the space of C^∞-smooth zero mean value functions on S^1.

For a nonnegative integer m and $p \in [1, \infty]$, $W^{m,p}$ stands for the Sobolev space of zero mean value functions v on S^1 with finite homogeneous norm

$$|v|_{m,p} = \left| \frac{d^m v}{dx^m} \right|_p .$$

In particular, $W^{0,p} = L_p$ for $p \in [1, \infty]$. For $p = 2$, we denote $W^{m,2}$ by H^m, and abbreviate the corresponding norm as $\|v\|_m$.

Note that since the length of S^1 is 1, we have

$$|v|_1 \leq |v|_\infty \leq |v|_{1,1} \leq |v|_{1,\infty} \leq \dots \leq |v|_{m,1} \leq |v|_{m,\infty} \leq \dots$$

We recall a version of the classical Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality (see [11, Appendix]):

Lemma 1.1. *For a smooth zero mean value function v on S^1,*

$$|v|_{\beta,r} \leq C \, |v|_{m,p}^{\theta} \, |v|_q^{1-\theta} ,$$

where $m > \beta \geq 0$, *and* r *is defined by*

$$\frac{1}{r} = \beta - \theta\Big(m - \frac{1}{p}\Big) + (1-\theta)\frac{1}{q},$$

under the assumption $\theta = \beta/m$ *if* $p = 1$ *or* $p = \infty$, *and* $\beta/m \leq \theta < 1$ *otherwise. The constant* C *depends on* m, p, q, β, θ.

For any $s \geq 0$, H^s stands for the Sobolev space of zero mean value functions v on S^1 with finite norm

$$\|v\|_s = (2\pi)^s \Big(\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |k|^{2s} |\hat{v}^k|^2 \Big)^{1/2}, \tag{5}$$

where $\hat{v}^k$ are the complex Fourier coefficients of $v(x)$. For integer values of $s = m$, this norm coincides with the previously defined H^m norm. For $s \in (0,1)$, $\|v\|_s$ is equivalent to the norm

$$\|v\|'_s = \left(\int_{S^1} \Big(\int_0^1 \frac{|v(x+\ell) - v(x)|^2}{\ell^{2s+1}} d\ell \Big) dx \right)^{1/2} \tag{6}$$

(see [1, 25]).

Subindices t and x, which can be repeated, denote partial differentiation with respect to the corresponding variables. $v^{(m)}$ denotes the m-th derivative of v in the variable x. For shortness, the function $v(t,\cdot)$ is denoted by $v(t)$.

1.2. **Random Setting.** We provide each space $W^{m,p}$ with the Borel σ-algebra. Then we consider a random process $w(t) = w^\omega(t)$, $\omega \in \Omega$, $t \geq 0$, defined on a complete probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ and valued in L_2. We assume that $w(t)$ defines a Wiener process with respect to a filtration $\mathcal{F}_t$, $t \geq 0$, in each space H^m, $m \geq 0$. In particular, for $\zeta, \chi \in L_2$,

$$\mathbf{E}(\langle w(s), \zeta \rangle \langle w(t), \chi \rangle) = \min(s,t) \langle Q\zeta, \chi \rangle,$$

where Q is a symmetric operator which defines a continuous mapping $Q : L_2 \to H^m$ for each m. Thus, $w(t) \in C^\infty$ for every t, almost surely. We will denote $w(t)(x)$ by $w(t,x)$. For more details, see [9, Chapter 4]. For $m \geq 0$, we denote by I_m the quantity

$$I_m = Tr_{H^m}(Q) = \mathbf{E} \|w(1)\|_m^2.$$

It is not difficult to construct $w(t)$ explicitly. For example we could take

$$w(t) = \sqrt{2} \sum_{k \geq 1} b_k \beta_k(t) \sin(2\pi k x) + \sqrt{2} \sum_{k \leq -1} b_k \beta_k(t) \cos(2\pi k x),$$

where $\beta_k(t),\ k \neq 0$ are standard independent Wiener processes and $I_m = \sum_{k\neq 0} b_k^2 (2\pi k)^{2m} < \infty$ for each m. From now on, the term $dw(s)$ denotes the stochastic differential corresponding to the Wiener process $w(s)$ in the space L_2.

Now fix $m \geq 0$. By Fernique's Theorem [23, Theorem 3.3.1], there exist $\lambda_m, C_m > 0$ such that

$$\mathbf{E} \exp\Big(\lambda_m \left\|w(T)\right\|_m^2 /T\Big) \leq C_m.$$

Therefore by Doob's maximal inequality for infinite-dimensional submartingales [9, Theorem 3.8. (ii)] we have

$$\mathbf{E} \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \left\|w(t)\right\|_m^p \leq \Big(\frac{p}{p-1}\Big)^p \mathbf{E} \left\|w(T)\right\|_m^p < +\infty, \tag{7}$$

for any $T > 0$, and $p \in (1, \infty)$.

1.3. **Preliminaries.** We begin by considering the free Burgers-type parabolic equation (1). Here, $t \geq 0$, $x \in S^1 = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$, and the viscosity coefficient satisfies $\nu \in (0, 1]$. The function f is C^∞-smooth and strongly convex, i.e. it verifies (2). We also assume that its derivatives satisfy:

$$\forall m \geq 0,\ \exists h \geq 0,\ C_m > 0 :\ |f^{(m)}(x)| \leq C_m(1 + |x|)^h, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{8}$$

where $h = h(m)$ is a function such that $h(1) = 2 - \delta,\ \delta > 0$. Note that actually (2) yields that $\delta \in (0, 1]$. The usual Burgers equation corresponds to $f(x) = x^2/2$.

The white-forced generalised Burgers equation is (1) with $\eta^\omega = \partial w^\omega/\partial t$, where $w^\omega(t),\ t \geq 0$ is the Wiener process with respect to $\mathcal{F}_t$ defined above.

Definition 1.2. *We say that an H^1-valued process $u(t, x) = u^\omega(t, x)$ is a solution of the equation*

$$\frac{\partial u^\omega}{\partial t} + f'(u^\omega)\frac{\partial u^\omega}{\partial x} - \nu\frac{\partial^2 u^\omega}{\partial x^2} = \eta^\omega \tag{9}$$

if

(i) For every t, $\omega \mapsto u^\omega(t, \cdot)$ is $\mathcal{F}_t$-measurable.

(ii) For a.e. (almost every) ω, $t \mapsto u^\omega(t, \cdot)$ is continuous in H^1 and satisfies

$$u^\omega(t) = u^\omega(0) - \int_0^t \Big(\nu L u^\omega(s) + \frac{1}{2} B(u^\omega)(s)\Big) ds + w^\omega(t), \tag{10}$$

where

$$B(u) = 2f'(u)u_x; \quad L = -\partial_{xx}.$$

When studying solutions of (9), we always assume that the initial condition $u_0 = u(0, \cdot)$ is C^∞-smooth, a.s. (almost surely). For a given random initial condition, we obtain that (9) has a unique solution, i.e. any two solutions coincide for a.e. ω. For shortness, this solution will be denoted by u. To prove this, we use the "mild solution" technique (cf. [10, Chapter 14]), a bootstrap argument, and finally uniform bounds of the same type as in Section 3.

Since the forcing and the initial condition are smooth in space, upper estimates of the same type as those proved in Section 3 allow us to show that $t \mapsto u(t)$ is time-continuous in H^m for every m, and $t \mapsto u(t) - w(t)$ has a time derivative in C^∞ for all t, a.s. In this paper, we always assume that u_0 satisfies (3); consequently, $u(t)$ satisfies (3) for all times.

Solutions of (9) make a time-continuous Markov process in H^1. For details, we refer to [22], where a white force is introduced in a similar setting.

Now consider, for a solution $u(t, x)$ of (9), the functional $G_m(u(t)) = \|u(t)\|_m^2$ and apply Itô's formula [9, Theorem 4.17] to (10):

$$\begin{aligned} \|u(t)\|_m^2 = \|u_0\|_m^2 + tI_m - \int_0^t \left(2\nu \|u(s)\|_{m+1}^2 + \langle L^m u(s),\ B(u)(s)\rangle\right) ds \\ + 2\int_0^t \langle L^m u(s),\ dw(s)\rangle \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

(we recall that $I_m = Tr(Q_m)$.) Consequently,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathbf{E}\,\|u(t)\|_m^2 = I_m - 2\nu \mathbf{E}\,\|u(t)\|_{m+1}^2 - \mathbf{E}\,\langle L^m u(t),\ B(u)(t)\rangle. \tag{12}$$

As $\langle u,\ B(u)\rangle = 0$, for $m = 0$ this relation becomes

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathbf{E}\,|u(t)|^2 = I_0 - 2\nu \mathbf{E}\,\|u(t)\|_1^2. \tag{13}$$

1.4. **Agreements.** From now on, all constants denoted by C with sub- or superindexes are strictly positive and nonrandom. Unless otherwise stated, they depend only on f and on the distribution of the Wiener process w. By $C(a_1, \dots, a_k)$ we denote constants which also depend on parameters $a_1, \dots, a_k$. By $X \overset{a_1,\dots,a_k}{\lesssim} Y$ we mean that $X \leq C(a_1, \dots, a_k)Y$. The notation $X \overset{a_1,\dots,a_k}{\sim} Y$ stands for

$$Y \overset{a_1,\dots,a_k}{\lesssim} X \overset{a_1,\dots,a_k}{\lesssim} Y.$$

In particular, $X \lesssim Y$ and $X \sim Y$ mean that $X \leq CY$ and $C^{-1}Y \leq X \leq CY$, respectively. All constants are independent of the viscosity ν and of the initial value u_0.

We denote by $u = u(t,x)$ a solution of (9) with an initial condition u_0. For simplicity, in Sections 3-6, we assume that u_0 is deterministic. However, using the Markov property we can easily generalise all results to the case of a random initial condition independent from $w(t), t \geq 0$. Indeed, for any measurable functional $\Phi(u(\cdot))$ we have

$$\mathbf{E}\Phi(u(\cdot)) = \int \mathbf{E}\Big(\Phi(u(\cdot))|u(0) = u_0\Big) d\mu(u_0),$$

where $\mu(u_0)$ is the law of u_0.

All estimates which hold for time t or a time interval $[t, t+T]$ actually hold for time $t+\tau$ or a time interval $[t+\tau, t+\tau+T]$, uniformly in $\tau \geq 0$. Indeed, it is enough to consider the solution of (9) with initial condition $u(\tau)$. We will refer to this argument as the "starting time argument".

We use the notation $g^- = \max(-g,0)$ and $g^+ = \max(g,0)$. For the meaning of the brackets $\{\cdot\}$, see Subsection 6.1.

2. Formulation of the Main Results

In Sections 3-5, we prove sharp upper and lower estimates for a large class of Sobolev norms of u. A key result is proved in Theorem 3.1. Namely, there we obtain that for $k \geq 1$,

$$\mathbf{E}\,\Big(\max_{s \in [t,t+1]} \max_{x \in S^1} u_x(s,x)\Big)^k \overset{k}{\lesssim} 1, \quad t \geq 1. \tag{14}$$

The main estimates are those in the first part of Theorem 5.1. There we prove that for $m \in \{0,1\}$ and $p \in [1,\infty]$ or for $m \geq 2$ and $p \in (1,\infty]$,

$$\Big(\frac{1}{T}\int_t^{t+T} \mathbf{E}\,|u(s)|_{m,p}^{\alpha}\Big)^{1/\alpha} \overset{m,p,\alpha}{\sim} \nu^{-\gamma}, \quad \alpha > 0,\ t \geq T_0+2,\ T \geq T_0, \tag{15}$$

where $\gamma = \max(0, m-1/p)$, and T_0 is a constant, depending on f and on the distribution of the process w.

In Section 6 we obtain sharp estimates for analogues of quantities characterising hydrodynamical turbulence. In what follows, $\{\cdot\}$ denotes averaging in time and in ensemble (see Subsection 6.1). Although we only prove results for quantities averaged over a time period of length T_0, those results can be immediately extended to quantities averaged over time periods of length $T \geq T_0$.

To begin with, we assume that $\nu \in (0,\nu_0]$, where $\nu_0 \in (0,1]$ only depends on f and on the distribution of w. We define intervals

$$J_1 = (0,\ C_1\nu];\ J_2 = (C_1\nu,\ C_2];\ J_3 = (C_2,\ 1]$$

by analogy to ranges in the Kolmogorov 1941 theory of turbulence [14]. The constants C_1, C_2, and ν_0 can take any value, as long as C_1/C_2 is large enough, and $C_1\nu_0 < C_2$. In particular, these assumptions ensure that the intervals J_1, J_2, and J_3 are non-empty and non-intersecting.

The interval J_1 corresponds to the *dissipation range*, i.e. for the Fourier modes k such that $|k|^{-1} \preceq C_1\nu$, $\{|\hat{u}^k|^2\}$ decreases super-algebraically in k. The interval J_2 corresponds to the *inertial range*, where averaged quantities such as the *energy spectrum*

$$E(k) = \left\{ \frac{\sum_{|n|\in[M^{-1}k,Mk]} |\hat{u}^n|^2}{\sum_{|n|\in[M^{-1}k,Mk]} 1} \right\}$$

behave as a negative degree of k. Here $M \geq 1$ is a constant depending only on f and the distribution of w. The boundary $C_1\nu$ between these two ranges is the *dissipation length scale*. Finally, the interval J_3 corresponds to the *energy range*, i.e. the sum $\Sigma\{|\hat{u}^k|^2\}$ is mostly supported by the Fourier modes corresponding to $|k|^{-1} \in J_3$:

$$\sum_{|k|\leq C_2^{-1}} \{|\hat{u}^k|^2\} \geq \frac{99}{100} \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \{|\hat{u}^k|^2\}.$$

The proportion of energy contained in the modes from J_3 actually tends to 1 when C_2 tends to 0, uniformly in ν. Now consider the averaged moments of increments in the variable x for the flow $u(t,x)$:

$$S_{p,\alpha}(\ell) = \Big\{ \Big(\int_{S^1} |u(x+\ell) - u(x)|^p dx \Big)^{\alpha} \Big\},\ \alpha \geq 0,\ 0 < \ell \leq 1.$$

In particular, $S_{p,1}(\ell)$ is (up to averaging) the *structure function* of p-th order and is denoted by $S_p(\ell)$. As the first application of estimates (14-15), in Section 6 we obtain sharp estimates for the quantities $S_{p,\alpha}$. Namely, by Theorem 6.9, for $\ell \in J_1$:

$$S_{p,\alpha}(\ell) \overset{p,\alpha}{\sim} \begin{cases} \ell^{\alpha p},\ 0 \leq p \leq 1. \\ \ell^{\alpha p}\nu^{-\alpha(p-1)},\ p \geq 1, \end{cases}$$

and on the other hand for $\ell \in J_2$:

$$S_{p,\alpha}(\ell) \overset{p,\alpha}{\sim} \begin{cases} \ell^{\alpha p},\ 0 \leq p \leq 1. \\ \ell^{\alpha},\ p \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Consequently, for $\ell \in J_2$ the flatness function $F(\ell) = S_4(\ell)/S_2^2(\ell)$ satisfies $F(\ell) \sim \ell^{-1}$. Thus, solutions u are highly intermittent in the inertial range (see [14]).

On the other hand, we obtain estimates for the spectral asymptotics of Burgulence. Namely, for all $m \geq 1$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z},\ k \neq 0$ we have:

$$\{|\hat{u}^k|^2\} \overset{m}{\lesssim} (k\nu)^{-2m}\nu,$$

and for k such that $k^{-1} \in J_2$,

$$\left\{ \left(\frac{\sum_{|n| \in [M^{-1}k, Mk]} |\hat{u}^n|^2}{\sum_{|n| \in [M^{-1}k, Mk]} 1} \right)^{\alpha} \right\} \overset{\alpha}{\sim} k^{-2\alpha}, \quad \alpha > 0.$$

In particular, in the inertial range the energy spectrum satisfies $E(k) \sim k^{-2}$.

Finally, in Section 7, we observe that since (9) admits a unique stationary measure μ, then all estimates listed above still hold if we replace the brackets $\{\cdot\}$ with averaging with respect to μ.

3. Upper Estimates for Sobolev Norms

The following theorem is proved using a stochastic version of the Kruzkov maximum principle (cf. [19]). Note that in all results in Sections 3-6, quantities estimated in space for fixed t, ω, such as $\max_{x \in S^1} u_x$ or Sobolev norms, may be replaced by their suprema over all smooth initial conditions. For instance, the quantity

$$\mathbf{E} \max_{s \in [t,t+1]} |u(s)|_{m,p}$$

may be replaced by

$$\mathbf{E} \max_{s \in [t,t+1]} \max_{u_0 \in C^\infty} |u(s)|_{m,p}.$$

Theorem 3.1. *Denote by X_t the random variable*

$$X_t = \max_{s \in [t,t+1]} \max_{x \in S^1} u_x(s,x).$$

For $k \geq 1$, we have

$$\mathbf{E}\ X_t^k \overset{k}{\lesssim} 1, \quad t \geq 1.$$

Proof. We take $t = 1$, denoting X_t by X, since by the "starting time argument" the general case $t \geq 1$ is proved in the same way.

Consider the equation (9) on the time interval $[0, 2]$. Putting $v = u - w$ and differentiating once in space, we get

$$\frac{\partial v_x}{\partial t} + f''(u)(v_x + w_x)^2 + f'(u)(v_x + w_x)_x = \nu (v_x + w_x)_{xx}. \tag{16}$$

Consider $\tilde{v}(t,x) = t v_x(t,x)$ and multiply (16) by t^2. For $t > 0$, $\tilde{v}$ verifies

$$\begin{aligned} & t\tilde{v}_t - \tilde{v} + f''(u)(\tilde{v} + t w_x)^2 + t f'(u) \tilde{v}_x + t^2 f'(u) w_{xx} \\ & = \nu t \tilde{v}_{xx} + \nu t^2 w_{xxx}. \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

Now observe that if the zero mean function $\tilde{v}$ does not vanish identically on the domain $S = [0,2] \times S^1$, then it attains its positive maximum N

on S at a point (t_1, x_1) such that $t_1 > 0$. At (t_1, x_1) we have $\tilde{v}_t \geq 0$, $\tilde{v}_x = 0$, and $\tilde{v}_{xx} \leq 0$. By (17), at (t_1, x_1) we have the inequality

$$f''(u)(\tilde{v} + tw_x)^2 \leq \tilde{v} - t^2 f'(u) w_{xx} + \nu t^2 w_{xxx}. \tag{18}$$

Denote by A the random variable

$$A = \max_{t \in [0,2]} |w(t)|_{C^3}.$$

Since for every t, $tv(t)$ is the zero space average primitive of $\tilde{v}(t)$ on S^1, we get

$$\max_{t \in [0,2],\ x \in S^1} |tu| \leq \max_{t \in [0,2],\ x \in S^1} (|tv| + |tw|) \leq N + 2A.$$

Since $h(1) = 2 - \delta$ in (8), then we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{t \in [0,2],\ x \in S^1} |t^2 f'(u) w_{xx}| &\leq At^\delta \max_{t \in [0,2],\ x \in S^1} t^{2-\delta}(|u|+1)^{2-\delta} \\ &\leq CA((N+2A)^{2-\delta} + 1). \end{aligned}$$

From now on, we assume that $N \geq 2A$. Since $\nu \in (0, 1]$ and $f'' \geq \sigma$, then the relation (18) yields

$$\sigma(N - 2A)^2 \leq N + CA(N + 2A)^{2-\delta} + CA.$$

Thus we have proved that if $N \geq 2A$, then $N \leq C(A + 1)^{1/\delta}$. Since by (7), all moments of A are finite, then all moments of N are also finite. By definition of $\tilde{v}$ and S, the same is true for X. This proves the lemma's assertion. $\square$

REMARK 3.2. *Actually, using an infinite-dimensional version of the supermartingale inequality (see* [9, Lemma 10.15], [24, Section 2.9]*), we can prove that there exist* $\beta, \beta' > 0$ *such that*

$$\mathbf{E} \exp(\beta X_t^{2\delta}) \leq \mathbf{E} \exp\Big(\beta' (\max_{t \in [0,2]} |w(t)|_{C^3} + 1)^2\Big) \lesssim 1, \quad t \geq 1.$$

COROLLARY 3.3. *For* $k \geq 1$,

$$\mathbf{E} \max_{s \in [t, t+1]} |u(s)|_{1,1}^k \overset{k}{\lesssim} 1, \quad t \geq 1.$$

Proof. The space average of $u_x(s)$ vanishes identically. Therefore

$$\int_{S^1} |u_x(s)| = 2 \int_{S^1} (u_x(s))^+ \leq 2 \max_{x \in S^1} u_x(s, x). \quad \square$$

COROLLARY 3.4. *For* $k \geq 1$,

$$\mathbf{E} \max_{s \in [t, t+1]} |u(s)|_p^k \overset{k}{\lesssim} 1, \quad p \in [1, \infty], \ t \geq 1.$$

Now we recall a standard estimate of the nonlinearity $\langle L^m u, B(u)\rangle$ (see Subsection 1.3 for the definitions of L and B).

LEMMA 3.5. *For $w \in C^\infty$ such that $|w|_\infty \leq N$, we have*

$$N_m(w) = |\langle L^m w, B(w)\rangle| \leq C' \left\|w\right\|_m \left\|w\right\|_{m+1}, \quad m \geq 1,$$

with

$$C' = C_m(1+N)^{n'}, \tag{19}$$

where C_m, as well as the natural number $n' = n'(m)$, depend only on m.

Proof. Fix $m \geq 1$. Let C' denote various strictly positive constants of the form (19). We have

$$\begin{aligned} N_m(w) &= 2\left|\left\langle w^{(2m)}, (f(w))^{(1)}\right\rangle\right| = 2\left|\left\langle w^{(m+1)}, (f(w))^{(m)}\right\rangle\right| \\ &\leq C(m)\sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{\substack{1\leq a_1\leq\dots\leq a_k\leq m\\ a_1+\dots+a_k=m}} \int_{S^1} \left|w^{(m+1)} w^{(a_1)}\dots w^{(a_k)} f^{(k)}(w)\right| \\ &\leq C(m)\left|f\right|_{C^m([-N,N])} \sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{\substack{1\leq a_1\leq\dots\leq a_k\leq m\\ a_1+\dots+a_k=m}} \int_{S^1} |w^{(a_1)}\dots w^{(a_k)} w^{(m+1)}|. \end{aligned}$$

By (8), $|f|_{C^m([-N,N])}$ has an upper bound of the form (19). Using first Hölder's inequality and then Lemma 1.1, we get

$$\begin{aligned} N_m(w) \leq& C' \sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{\substack{1\leq a_1\leq\dots\leq a_k\leq m\\ a_1+\dots+a_k=m}} \Big(\left|w^{(a_1)}\right|_{2m/a_1} \dots \left|w^{(a_k)}\right|_{2m/a_k} \left\|w\right\|_{m+1} \Big). \\ \leq& C' \left\|w\right\|_{m+1} \sum_{k=1}^{m} \sum_{\substack{1\leq a_1\leq\dots\leq a_k\leq m\\ a_1+\dots+a_k=m}} \Big((\left\|w\right\|_m^{a_1/m} \left|w\right|_\infty^{(m-a_1)/m}) \times \dots \\ & \dots \times (\left\|w\right\|_m^{a_k/m} \left|w\right|_\infty^{(m-a_k)/m}) \Big) \\ \leq& C'(1+|w|_\infty)^{m-1} \left\|w\right\|_m \left\|w\right\|_{m+1} = C' \left\|w\right\|_m \left\|w\right\|_{m+1}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

The following upper estimate of $\mathbf{E}\left\|u(t)\right\|_m^2$ holds uniformly for $t \geq 2$.

LEMMA 3.6. *For $m \geq 1$,*

$$\mathbf{E}\left\|u(t)\right\|_m^2 \overset{m}{\lesssim} \nu^{-(2m-1)}, \quad t \geq 2.$$

Proof. Fix $m \geq 1$. We will use the notation

$$x(s) = \mathbf{E} \left\| u(s) \right\|_m^2 ; \quad y(s) = \mathbf{E} \left\| u(s) \right\|_{m+1}^2 .$$

We take $t = 2$; the general case follows by the "starting time argument". We claim that for $s \in [1, 2]$ we have the implication

$$\begin{aligned} &x(s) \geq C' \nu^{-(2m-1)} \Longrightarrow \\ &\frac{d}{ds} x(s) \leq -(2m-1)(x(s))^{2m/(2m-1)}, \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where $C' \geq 1$ is a fixed strictly positive number, chosen later. Below, all constants denoted by C are strictly positive and do not depend on C', and we denote by Z the quantity

$$Z = C' \nu^{-(2m-1)}.$$

Indeed, assume that $x(s) \geq Z$. By (12) and Lemma 3.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{ds} x(s) \leq & -2\nu \mathbf{E} \left\| u(s) \right\|_{m+1}^2 + C \mathbf{E} \Big((1 + |u(s)|_\infty)^{n'} \left\| u(s) \right\|_m \\ & \times \left\| u(s) \right\|_{m+1} \Big) + I_m, \end{aligned}$$

with $n' = n'(m)$. Since by Lemma 1.1 applied to u_x, we get

$$\left\| u(s) \right\|_m \leq C \left\| u(s) \right\|_{m+1}^{(2m-1)/(2m+1)} |u(s)|_{1,1}^{2/(2m+1)}, \tag{21}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{ds} x(s) \leq & -2\nu \mathbf{E} \left\| u(s) \right\|_{m+1}^2 + C \mathbf{E} \Big((1 + |u(s)|_{1,1})^{n' + 2/(2m+1)} \\ & \times \left\| u(s) \right\|_{m+1}^{4m/(2m+1)} \Big) + I_m. \end{aligned}$$

Thus by Hölder's inequality and Corollary 3.3 we get

$$\frac{d}{ds} x(s) \leq \Big(-2\nu (y(s))^{1/(2m+1)} + C \Big) (y(s))^{2m/(2m+1)} + I_m.$$

On the other hand, (21), Hölder's inequality, and Corollary 3.3 yield

$$\begin{aligned} x(s) \leq & C (y(s))^{(2m-1)/(2m+1)} (\mathbf{E} |u(s)|_{1,1}^2)^{2/(2m+1)} \\ \leq & C (y(s))^{(2m-1)/(2m+1)}, \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$(y(s))^{1/(2m+1)} \geq C (x(s))^{1/(2m-1)}.$$

Consequently, since $x(s) \geq C' \nu^{-(2m-1)}$, then for C' large enough we have

$$\frac{d}{ds} x(s) \leq \left(-C C'^{1/(2m-1)} + C \right) (x(s))^{2m/(2m-1)} + I_m.$$

Thus we can choose C' in such a way that (20) holds.

Now we claim that

$$x(2) \leq Z. \tag{22}$$

Indeed, if $x(s) \leq Z$ for some $s \in [1,2]$, then the assertion (20) ensures that $x(s)$ remains below this threshold up to $s = 2$: thus we have proved (22).

Now, assume that $x(s) > Z$ for all $s \in [1,2]$. Denote

$$\tilde{x}(s) = (x(s))^{-1/(2m-1)},\ s \in [1,2]\,.$$

Using the implication (20) we get $d\tilde{x}(s)/ds \geq 1$. Therefore $\tilde{x}(2) \geq 1$. As $\nu \leq 1$ and $C' \geq 1$, we get $x(2) \leq Z$. Thus in both cases inequality (22) holds. This proves the lemma's assertion. $\square$

Corollary 3.7. *For $m \geq 1$,*

$$\mathbf{E}\, \|u(t)\|_m^k \overset{m,k}{\lesssim} \nu^{-k(2m-1)/2}, \quad k \geq 1,\ t \geq 2.$$

Proof. The cases $k = 1, 2$ follow immediately from Lemma 3.6.

For $k \geq 3$, we consider only the case when k is odd, since the general case follows by Hölder's inequality. Setting $N = ((2m-1)k+1)/2$ and applying Lemma 1.1, we get

$$\|u(t)\|_m^k \overset{m,k}{\lesssim} \|u(t)\|_N\, |u(t)|_{1,1}^{k-1}\,.$$

Therefore, by Hölder's inequality, Lemma 3.6, and Corollary 3.3 we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}\, \|u(t)\|_m^k &\overset{m,k}{\lesssim} (\mathbf{E}\, \|u(t)\|_N^2)^{1/2} (\mathbf{E}\, |u(t)|_{1,1}^{2k-2})^{1/2} \\ &\overset{m,k}{\lesssim} \nu^{-(N-1/2)} = \nu^{-k(2m-1)/2}. \quad \square\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.8. *For $m \geq 1$,*

$$\mathbf{E} \max_{s \in [t,t+1]} \|u(s)\|_m^2 \overset{m}{\lesssim} \nu^{-(2m-1)}, \quad t \geq 2.$$

Proof. We begin by fixing $m \geq 1$. As previously, we take $t = 2$. In this proof, the random constants $\Theta_i,\ i = 1,2,3$ are strictly positive and have finite moments.

By (11), for $s \geq 2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|u(s)\|_m^2 = \|u(2)\|_m^2 &\\ + \int_2^s \Big(-2\nu\, \|u(s')\|_{m+1}^2 - \langle L^m u(s'),\ B(u)(s')\rangle + I_m\Big)\, ds' &\\ + \int_2^s 2\langle L^m u(s'),\ dw(s')\rangle. &\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

Corollary 3.3 and Lemma 3.6 yield that

$$\max_{s'\in[2,3]} |u(s')|_{1,1} \leq \Theta_1; \qquad \|u(2)\|_m^2 \leq \Theta_2 \nu^{-(2m-1)}, \tag{24}$$

respectively. By the same method as in the proof of Lemma 3.6 we show that:

$$\begin{aligned}&\|u(s')\|_m^2 \geq \Theta_3 \nu^{-(2m-1)} \Longrightarrow\\ &-2\nu \|u(s')\|_{m+1}^2 - \langle L^m u(s'),\ B(u)(s')\rangle + I_m \leq 0.\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

Here Θ_3 satisfies $\Theta_3 = C(1+\Theta_1)^{n'}$, where C, n' depend only on m. Now consider the random time moment τ defined by

$$\tau = \{\inf s \in [2,3] : \|u(s)\|_m^2 \geq \Theta_3 \nu^{-(2m-1)}\}.$$

By convention, $\tau = 3$ if the set in question is empty. Relations (23-25) yield that

$$\begin{aligned}\max_{s\in[2,3]} \|u(s)\|_m^2 &\leq \|u(\tau)\|_m^2 + \max_{s\in[\tau,3]} \int_\tau^s 2\langle L^m u(s'),\ dw(s')\rangle\\ &\leq \max(\Theta_2,\Theta_3)\nu^{-(2m-1)} + 4 \max_{s\in[2,3]} \Big| \int_2^s \langle L^m u(s'),\ dw(s')\rangle \Big|.\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

To complete the proof, it remains to estimate the expression

$$\max_{s\in[2,3]} \Big| \int_2^s \langle L^m u(s'),\ dw(s')\rangle \Big|$$

in the right-hand side of (26). Denote by $\xi(s)$ the stochastic integral

$$\xi(s) = \int_2^s \langle L^m u(s'),\ dw(s')\rangle.$$

By the Burkholder-Davis-Gundy inequality [9, Theorem 3.14.] and Lemma 3.6 we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E} \max_{s\in[2,3]} |\xi(s)| &\leq \mathbf{E} \max_{s\in[2,3]} \xi(s) + \mathbf{E} \max_{s\in[2,3]} (-\xi(s)) \leq C\Big(\mathbf{E}\langle\langle \xi\rangle\rangle_{[2,3]}\Big)^{1/2}\\ &= C\Big(\mathbf{E}\int_2^3 \langle L^m u(s), Qu(s)\rangle\Big)^{1/2}\\ &\leq C(\max_{s\in[2,3]} I_m \mathbf{E}\, \|u(s)\|_m^2)^{1/2} \leq C\nu^{-(2m-1)/2}.\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Here, $\langle\langle \xi\rangle\rangle_{[2,3]}$ denotes the quadratic variation of ξ over the time interval $[2,3]$. We recall that Q is the operator defined in Subsection 1.2, and that $I_m = Tr\ Q|_{H_m}$. Relations (26) and (27) imply that

$$\mathbf{E} \max_{s\in[2,3]} \|u(s)\|_m^2 \leq \mathbf{E} \max(\Theta_2,\Theta_3)\nu^{-(2m-1)} + C\nu^{-(2m-1)/2},$$

which proves the lemma's assertion. $\square$

Repeating the proof of Corollary 3.7 we get that for $m \geq 1$,

$$\mathbf{E} \max_{s \in [t,t+1]} \|u(s)\|_m^k \overset{m,k}{\lesssim} \nu^{-k(2m-1)/2}, \quad k \geq 1,\ t \geq 2. \tag{28}$$

Denote $\gamma = \max(0, m - 1/p)$.

Theorem 3.9. *For $m \in \{0,1\}$ and $p \in [1,+\infty]$, or for $m \geq 2$ and $p \in (1,\infty]$,*

$$\Big(\mathbf{E} \max_{s \in [t,t+1]} |u(s)|_{m,p}^\alpha\Big)^{1/\alpha} \overset{m,p,\alpha}{\lesssim} \nu^{-\gamma}, \quad \alpha > 0,\ t \geq 2.$$

Proof. We consider only the case when α is an integer: the general case follows by Hölder's inequality.

For $m \geq 1$ and $p \in [2,\infty]$, we interpolate $|u(s)|_{m,p}$ between $\|u(s)\|_m$ and $\|u(s)\|_{m+1}$. By Lemma 1.1 we have

$$|u(s)|_{m,p}^\alpha \overset{p}{\lesssim} (\|u(s)\|_m^\alpha)^{1-\theta} (\|u(s)\|_{m+1}^\alpha)^\theta,\ \theta = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p}.$$

Then we use (28) and Hölder's inequality to complete the proof.

We use the same method to prove the cases $m = 1,\ p \in [1,2]$, combining the inequality (28) and Corollary 3.3. We also proceed similarly for $m \geq 3, p \in (1,2)$, combining Corollary 3.3 and an estimate for $\|u\|_{M,p}^\alpha$ for a large value of M and some $p \geq 2$.

Finally, the case $m = 0$ follows from Corollary 3.4. $\square$

Unfortunately, the proof of Theorem 3.9 cannot be adapted to the case $m \geq 2$ and $p = 1$. Indeed, Lemma 1.1 only allows us to estimate a $W^{m,1}$ norm from above by other $W^{m,1}$ norms: we can only get that

$$|w|_{m,1} \overset{m,n,k}{\lesssim} |w|_{n,1}^{(m-k)/(n-k)} |w|_{k,1}^{(n-m)/(n-k)},\ 0 \leq k < m < n,$$

and thus the upper estimates obtained above cannot be used. However, $|u|_{m,1} \leq |u|_{m,1+\beta}$ for any $\beta > 0$. Consequently, the theorem's statement holds for $m \geq 2$ and $p = 1$, with γ replaced by $\gamma + \lambda$, and $\overset{m,p,\alpha}{\lesssim}$ replaced by $\overset{m,p,\alpha,\lambda}{\lesssim}$, for any $\lambda > 0$.

4. Lower Estimates for Sobolev Norms

For a solution $u(t)$ of (9), the first quantity that we estimate from below is the expected value of $\frac{1}{T}\int_1^{T+1} \|u(s)\|_1^2$, where $T > 0$ is sufficiently large.

Lemma 4.1. *There exists a constant* $T_0 > 0$ *such that we have*

$$\frac{1}{T}\int_1^{T+1} \mathbf{E}\,\|u(s)\|_1^2 \gtrsim \nu^{-1}, \qquad T \geq T_0.$$

Proof. For $T > 0$, by (13) we get

$$\mathbf{E}\,|u(T+1)|^2 \geq \mathbf{E}(|u(T+1)|^2 - |u(1)|^2) = TI_0 - 2\nu\int_1^{T+1} \mathbf{E}\,\|u(s)\|_1^2.$$

On the other hand, by Corollary 3.4 there exists a constant $C' > 0$ such that $\mathbf{E}\,|u(T+1)|^2 \leq C'$. Consequently, for $T \geq T_0 := (C'+1)/I_0$,

$$\frac{1}{T}\int_1^{T+1} \mathbf{E}\,\|u(s)\|_1^2 \geq \frac{TI_0 - C'}{2T}\nu^{-1} \geq \frac{I_0}{2(C'+1)}\nu^{-1},$$

which proves the lemma's assertion. $\square$

This time-averaged lower bound of the H^1 norm yields similar bounds of H^m norms for $m \geq 2$.

Lemma 4.2. *For* $m \geq 1$,

$$\frac{1}{T}\int_t^{t+T} \mathbf{E}\,\|u(s)\|_m^2 \overset{m}{\gtrsim} \nu^{-(2m-1)}, \qquad t \geq 1,\ T \geq T_0.$$

Proof. By the "starting time argument", we can take $t = 1$. Since the case $m = 1$ has been treated in the previous lemma, we may assume that $m \geq 2$. By Lemma 1.1, Hölder's inequality, and Corollary 3.3 we have

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathbf{E}\,\|u(s)\|_1^2)^{(2m-1)} &\overset{m}{\lesssim} (\mathbf{E}\,\|u(s)\|_m^2)(\mathbf{E}\,|u(s)|_{1,1}^2)^{(2m-2)} \\ &\overset{m}{\lesssim} \mathbf{E}\,\|u(s)\|_m^2 .\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

Integrating (29) in time, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{T}\int_1^{T+1} \mathbf{E}\,\|u(s)\|_m^2 &\overset{m}{\gtrsim} \frac{1}{T}\int_1^{T+1} (\mathbf{E}\,\|u(s)\|_1^2)^{(2m-1)} \\ &\overset{m}{\gtrsim} \Big(\frac{1}{T}\int_1^{T+1} \mathbf{E}\,\|u(s)\|_1^2\Big)^{(2m-1)}.\end{aligned}$$

Now the theorem's assertion follows from Lemma 4.1. $\square$

The following two results generalise Lemma 4.2. We recall that $\gamma = \max(0, m - 1/p)$.

Lemma 4.3. *For* $m = 0$ *and* $p = \infty$, *or for* $m \geq 1$ *and* $p \in [1,\infty]$,

$$\frac{1}{T}\int_t^{t+T} \mathbf{E}\,|u(s)|_{m,p}^2 \overset{m,p}{\gtrsim} \nu^{-\gamma}, \quad t \geq 2,\ T \geq T_0.$$

Proof. In the case $m = 1,\ p \geq 2$, it suffices to apply Hölder's inequality in place of Lemma 1.1 in the proof of an analogue for Lemma 4.2.

In the case $m \geq 2$, the proof is exactly the same as for Lemma 4.2. The only problematic case is $p = 1$, since then Lemma 1.1 does not allow us to estimate $|u(s)|^2_{m,p}$ from below using $|u(s)|^2_{1,1}$ and $\|u(s)\|^2_1$. However, it suffices to observe that $|u(s)|_{m,1} \geq |u(s)|_{m-1,\infty}$.

Now consider the case $m = 1,\ p \in [1,2)$. By Hölder's inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{T}\int_t^{t+T} \mathbf{E}\,|u(s)|^2_{1,p} \geq &\Big(\frac{1}{T}\int_t^{t+T} \mathbf{E}\,\|u(s)\|^2_1\Big)^{2/p} \\ &\times \Big(\frac{1}{T}\int_t^{t+T} \mathbf{E}\,|u(s)|^2_{1,\infty}\Big)^{(p-2)/p}.\end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 4.1 and Theorem 3.9, we get the lemma's assertion.

We proceed similarly for the case $m = 0,\ p = \infty$. Indeed, by Lemma 1.1 we have $|u(s)|_{1,\infty} \leq C\,|u(s)|^{1/2}_{\infty}\,|u(s)|^{1/2}_{2,\infty}$, and the lemma's assertion follows from Hölder's inequality, the case $m = 1,\ p = \infty$, and Theorem 3.9. $\square$

Lemma 4.4. *For $m = 0$ and $p = \infty$, or for $m \geq 1$ and $p \in [1,\infty]$,*

$$\Big(\frac{1}{T}\int_t^{t+T} \mathbf{E}\,|u(s)|^{\alpha}_{m,p}\Big)^{1/\alpha} \overset{m,p,\alpha}{\gtrsim} \nu^{-\gamma}, \quad \alpha > 0,\ t \geq 2,\ T \geq T_0.$$

Proof. As previously, we may assume that $p > 1$. The case $\alpha \geq 2$ follows immediately from Lemma 4.3 and Hölder's inequality. The case $\alpha < 2$ follows from Hölder's inequality, the case $\alpha = 2$, and Theorem 3.9 (case $\alpha = 3$), since we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{T}\int_t^{t+T} \mathbf{E}\,|u(s)|^{\alpha}_{m,p} \geq &\Big(\frac{1}{T}\int_t^{t+T} \mathbf{E}\,|u(s)|^2_{m,p}\Big)^{3-\alpha} \\ &\times \Big(\frac{1}{T}\int_t^{t+T} \mathbf{E}\,|u(s)|^3_{m,p}\Big)^{\alpha-2}. \quad \square\end{aligned}$$

Now we prove that for every $p \in [1,\infty)$, in a certain sense, $\mathbf{E}|u|_p$ is large if and only if $\mathbf{E}|u|_\infty$ is large.

Lemma 4.5. *For $t \geq 1$, denote by A the quantity $\mathbf{E}|u(t)|^2_\infty$. Then there exists a constant $C' > 0$ such that for $p \in [1,\infty]$ we have*

$$\tilde{g}(A) := \min\Big(\frac{3A}{8}, \frac{3A^2}{16C'}\Big) \leq \mathbf{E}|u(t)|^2_p \leq A.$$

Proof. We may take $p = 1$. Denote by l the quantity

$$l = \min(\sqrt{A/2C'},\ 1),$$

where C' is the upper bound for $\mathbf{E}\, X_t^2$ in the statement of Theorem 3.1. Consider the random point $x = x_t$ where $|u(t, \cdot)|$ reaches its maximum. If this point is not unique, let x be the leftmost such point on S^1 considered as $[0, 1)$. Let I be the interval $[x, x + l]$ if $u(t, x) < 0$, and the interval $[x - l, x]$ if $u(t, x) \geq 0$, respectively. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{E}|u(t)|_1^2 &\geq \mathbf{E} \left(\int_I |u(t,y)| dy \right)^2 \\
&\geq \mathbf{E} \left(l \left(|u(t)|_\infty - \frac{l \max_{x \in S^1} u_x(t)}{2} \right) \right)^2 \\
&\geq l^2 \left(\frac{3}{4} \mathbf{E}|u(t)|_\infty^2 - \frac{3l^2}{4} \mathbf{E}\Big((\max_{x \in S^1} u_x(t))^2 \Big) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

By definition of A, C', and l, we get

$$\mathbf{E}|u(t)|_1^2 \geq l^2 \left(\frac{3A}{4} - \frac{3l^2 C'}{4} \right) \geq \frac{3l^2 A}{8} = \tilde{g}(A). \quad \square$$

Finally we prove the following uniform lower estimate.

Lemma 4.6. *We have*

$$\mathbf{E}|u(t)|_p^2 \gtrsim 1, \quad t \geq T_0 + 2,\ p \in [1, \infty].$$

Proof. We can take $p = 2$. Indeed, the case $p \in (2, \infty]$ follows immediately from the case $p = 2$. On the other hand, the case $p \in [1, 2)$ follows from Hölder's inequality, the case $p = 2$, and the estimate for $\mathbf{E}|u|_\infty^2$ in Theorem 3.9, in the same way as in the proof of Lemma 4.4.

Let C' denote various strictly positive constants. From Lemma 4.4 (case $m = 0$ and $p = \infty$), it follows that for some $\tilde{t}$ in $[2, T_0 + 2]$ we have $\mathbf{E}|u(\tilde{t})|_\infty^2 \geq C'$. Then by Lemma 4.5 we get $\mathbf{E}|u(\tilde{t})|^2 \geq C'$. Thus it suffices to prove that

$$\mathbf{E}|u(t)|^2 \leq \kappa \Longrightarrow \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{E}|u(t)|^2 \geq 0, \quad t \geq 2,$$

where κ is a fixed strictly positive number, chosen later.

If $\mathbf{E}|u(t)|^2 \leq \kappa$, then by Lemma 4.5, $\mathbf{E}|u(t)|_\infty^2 \leq \tilde{g}^{-1}(\kappa)$. On the other hand, by Hölder's inequality and Lemma 1.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{E}\,\|u(t)\|_1^2 &\leq (\mathbf{E}|u(t)|_{1,\infty}^2)^{1/2}(\mathbf{E}|u(t)|_{1,1}^2)^{1/2}\\ &\leq C'(\mathbf{E}|u(t)|_{\infty}^2)^{1/4}(\mathbf{E}|u(t)|_{2,\infty}^2)^{1/4}(\mathbf{E}|u(t)|_{1,1}^2)^{1/2}.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Theorem 3.9, $\mathbf{E}\,\|u(t)\|_1^2 \leq C'(\tilde{g}^{-1}(\kappa))^{1/4}\nu^{-1}$, and thus by (13), we get:

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathbf{E}|u(t)|^2 \geq I_0 - 2C'(\tilde{g}^{-1}(\kappa))^{1/4}.$$

Since $\tilde{g}^{-1}(\kappa) \underset{\kappa\to 0}{\longrightarrow} 0$, choosing κ small enough so that $2C'(\tilde{g}^{-1}(\kappa))^{1/4} \leq I_0$ proves the lemma's assertion. $\square$

Since $|u(t)|_{1,1} \geq |u(t)|_{\infty}$, an analogue of Lemma 4.6 also holds for $|u(t)|_{1,1}$.

5. Sobolev Norms: Main Theorem

The following theorem sums up the main results of Sections 3-4, with the exception of Theorem 3.1. We recall that $\gamma = \max(0, m - 1/p)$.

For m and p such that $\gamma(m,p) = 0$, the lower estimates for $\alpha < 2$ are obtained from Hölder's inequality, the lower estimates for $\alpha = 2$, and the upper estimates for $\alpha = 3$ in the same way as in the proof of Lemma 4.4. The lower estimates for $\alpha > 2$ follow immediately from the lower estimates for $\alpha = 2$.

Theorem 5.1. *For $m \in \{0,1\}$ and $p \in [1,\infty]$, or for $m \geq 2$ and $p \in (1,\infty]$,*

$$\Big(\frac{1}{T}\int_t^{t+T} \mathbf{E}\,|u(s)|_{m,p}^{\alpha}\Big)^{1/\alpha} \overset{m,p,\alpha}{\sim} \nu^{-\gamma}, \quad \alpha > 0,\ t \geq T_0 + 2,\ T \geq T_0. \quad (30)$$

Moreover, the upper estimates hold with time-averaging replaced by maximising over $[t, t+1]$ for $t \geq 2$, i.e.

$$\Big(\mathbf{E}\max_{s\in[t,t+1]} |u(s)|_{m,p}^{\alpha}\Big)^{1/\alpha} \overset{m,p,\alpha}{\lesssim} \nu^{-\gamma}, \quad \alpha > 0,\ t \geq 2.$$

On the other hand, the lower estimates hold for all m, p. The asymptotics (30) hold without time-averaging if m and p are such that $\gamma(m,p) = 0$. Namely, in this case,

$$\Big(\mathbf{E}\,|u(t)|_{m,p}^{\alpha}\Big)^{1/\alpha} \overset{m,p,\alpha}{\sim} 1, \quad \alpha > 0,\ t \geq T_0 + 2.$$

Finally, note that all these estimates hold if we replace Sobolev norms with their suprema over all smooth initial conditions.

This theorem yields, for integers $m \geq 1$, the relation

$$\{\|u\|_m^2\} \overset{m}{\sim} \nu^{-(2m-1)}. \tag{31}$$

By a standard interpolation argument (see (5)) the upper bound in (31) also holds for non-integer numbers $s > 1$. Actually, the same is true for the lower bound, since for any integer $n > s$ we have

$$\{\|u\|_s^2\} \geq \{\|u\|_n^2\}^{n-s+1}\{\|u\|_{n+1}^2\}^{-(n-s)} \overset{s}{\gtrsim} \nu^{-(2s-1)}.$$

6. Estimates for Small-Scale Quantities

In this section, we estimate small-scale quantities which characterise Burgulence in physical space (increments, flatness) as well as in Fourier space (energy spectrum).

6.1. **Agreements and Notation.**

In this section, we fix t satisfying $t \geq T_0 + 2$. Its precise value is not important, since all estimates in Sections 3-5 hold uniformly in t provided that $t \geq T_0 + 2$, and the same is true for all estimates in this section.

For a random function $A^\omega(s)$, we denote by $\{A\}$ the average of A in ensemble and in time over $[t, t+T_0]$, T_0 being the same as in Theorem 5.1:

$$\{A\} = \mathbf{E}\frac{1}{T_0}\int_t^{t+T_0} A^\omega(s)ds.$$

We assume that $\nu \leq \nu_0$. Next, we define the intervals

$$J_1 = (0,\ C_1\nu];\ J_2 = (C_1\nu,\ C_2];\ J_3 = (C_2,\ 1]. \tag{32}$$

In other words, $J_1 = \{\ell :\ 0 < \ell \lesssim \nu\}$, $J_2 = \{\ell :\ \nu \lesssim \ell \lesssim 1\}$, $J_3 = \{\ell :\ \ell \sim 1\}$. In terms of the Kolmogorov 1941 theory of turbulence (cf. [14]), $C_1\nu$ corresponds to the dissipation length scale, while J_1, J_2, and J_3 correspond to the dissipation range, the inertial range, and the energy range, respectively.

The strictly positive constants C_1, C_2, and ν_0 will be chosen in (42). Actually these constants can take any value, provided

$$C_1 \leq K^{-2}/4; \quad 5K^2 \leq \frac{C_1}{C_2} < \frac{1}{\nu_0}. \tag{33}$$

Here, K is a strictly positive constant, chosen in (41). Note that the intervals defined by (32-33) are non-empty and do not intersect each other for all values of $\nu \in (0, \nu_0]$.

The constants C_1 and C_2 can be made as small as desired. On the other hand, by Theorem 5.1 we have $\{|u|^2\} \sim 1$ and (after integration by parts) $\{|\hat{u}^n|^2\} \leq \{|u|_{1,1}^2\}/(2\pi n)^2 \sim 1/n^2$. We recall that we denote by $\hat{u}^n$ the complex Fourier coefficients of u. Thus, the proportion of the sum $\Sigma|\hat{u}^n|^2$ contained in Fourier modes corresponding to J_3 tends to 1 as C_2 tends to 0, uniformly in ν. For instance, we may assume that

$$\sum_{|n|\leq C_2^{-1}} \{|\hat{u}^n|^2\} \geq \frac{99}{100} \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \{|\hat{u}^n|^2\}.$$

For $p, \alpha \geq 0$, we consider the quantity

$$S_{p,\alpha}(\ell) = \Big\{ \Big(\int_{S^1} |u(x+\ell) - u(x)|^p dx \Big)^{\alpha} \Big\}.$$

The quantity $S_{p,1}(\ell)$ is denoted by $S_p(\ell)$: it corresponds (up to averaging) to the structure function of p-th order, while the flatness $F(\ell)$, given by

$$F(\ell) = S_4(\ell)/S_2^2(\ell), \tag{34}$$

measures spatial intermittency (see [14]). Finally, for $k \geq 1$, we define the (layer-averaged) energy spectrum by:

$$E(k) = \left\{ \frac{\sum_{|n|\in[M^{-1}k,Mk]} |\hat{u}^n|^2}{\sum_{|n|\in[M^{-1}k,Mk]} 1} \right\}. \tag{35}$$

The constant $M \geq 1$ will be chosen in the proof of Theorem 6.13.

6.2. **Results in Physical Space.** We begin by proving upper estimates for the functions $S_{p,\alpha}(\ell)$. In the proofs of the two following lemmas, constants denoted by C depend only on p, α.

LEMMA 6.1. *For $\alpha \geq 0$ and $\ell \in [0,1]$,*

$$S_{p,\alpha}(\ell) \overset{p,\alpha}{\lesssim} \begin{cases} \ell^{\alpha p}, \ 0 \leq p \leq 1. \\ \ell^{\alpha p} \nu^{-\alpha(p-1)}, \ p \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Proof. We begin by considering the case $p \geq 1$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} S_{p,\alpha}(\ell) &= \Big\{ \Big(\int_{S^1} |u(x+\ell) - u(x)|^p dx \Big)^{\alpha} \Big\} \\ &\leq \Big\{ \Big(\max_x |u(x+\ell) - u(x)|^{p-1} \int_{S^1} |u(x+\ell) - u(x)| dx \Big)^{\alpha} \Big\}. \end{aligned}$$

By Hölder's inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned} S_{p,\alpha}(\ell) \leq & \Big\{ \Big(\int_{S^1} |u(x+\ell) - u(x)| dx \Big)^{\alpha p} \Big\}^{1/p} \\ & \times \Big\{ \max_x |u(x+\ell) - u(x)|^{\alpha p} \Big\}^{(p-1)/p}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the space average of $u(x+\ell)-u(x)$ vanishes, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} S_{p,\alpha}(\ell) \leq & \Big\{ \Big(2 \int_{S^1} (u(x+\ell)-u(x))^+ dx \Big)^{\alpha p} \Big\}^{1/p} \\ & \times \Big\{ \max_x |u(x+\ell)-u(x)|^{\alpha p} \Big\}^{(p-1)/p} \\ \leq & C\ell^\alpha \Big\{ \max_x |u(x+\ell)-u(x)|^{\alpha p} \Big\}^{(p-1)/p}, \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

where the second inequality follows from Theorem 3.1. Finally, by Theorem 5.1 we get

$$S_{p,\alpha}(\ell) \leq C\ell^\alpha \Big\{ (\ell |u|_{1,\infty})^{\alpha p} \Big\}^{(p-1)/p} \leq C\ell^{\alpha p} \nu^{-\alpha(p-1)}.$$

The case $p<1$ follows immediately from the case $p=1$ since now $S_{p,\alpha}(\ell) \leq S_{1,\alpha p}(\ell)$, by Hölder's inequality. $\square$

For $\ell \in J_2 \cup J_3$, we have a better upper bound if $p \geq 1$.

LEMMA 6.2. *For $\alpha \geq 0$ and $\ell \in J_2 \cup J_3$,*

$$S_{p,\alpha}(\ell) \overset{p,\alpha}{\lesssim} \begin{cases} \ell^{\alpha p}, & 0 \leq p \leq 1. \\ \ell^\alpha, & p \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Proof. The calculations are almost the same as in the previous lemma. The only difference is that we use another upper bound for the right-hand side of (36). Namely, we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_{p,\alpha}(\ell) &\leq C\ell^\alpha \Big\{ \max_x |u(x+\ell)-u(x)|^{\alpha p} \Big\}^{(p-1)/p} \\ &\leq C\ell^\alpha \Big\{ (2|u|_\infty)^{\alpha p} \Big\}^{(p-1)/p} \leq C\ell^\alpha, \end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality follows from Theorem 5.1. $\square$

To prove lower estimates for $S_{p,\alpha}(\ell)$, we need a lemma. Loosely speaking, this lemma states that with a probability which is not too small, during a period of time which is not too small, several Sobolev norms are of the same order as their expected values. Note that in the following definition, (37-38) contain lower and upper estimates, while (39) only contains an upper estimate. The inequality $|u(s)|_\infty \leq \max u_x(s)$ in (37) always holds, since $u(s)$ has zero mean value and the length of S^1 is 1.

DEFINITION 6.3. *For a given solution $u(s) = u^\omega(s)$ and $K > 1$, we denote by L_K the set of all $(s, \omega) \in [t, t + T_0] \times \Omega$ such that*

$$K^{-1} \le |u(s)|_\infty \le \max u_x(s) \le K \tag{37}$$

$$K^{-1}\nu^{-1} \le |u(s)|_{1,\infty} \le K\nu^{-1} \tag{38}$$

$$|u(s)|_{2,\infty} \le K\nu^{-2}. \tag{39}$$

LEMMA 6.4. *There exist constants $C, K_1 > 0$ such that for $K \ge K_1$, $\rho(L_K) \ge C$. Here, ρ denotes the product measure of the Lebesgue measure and $\mathbf{P}$ on $[t, t + T_0] \times \Omega$.*

Proof. We denote by A_K, B_K, and D_K the set of (s, ω) satisfying

"The upper estimates in (37-39) hold for a given value of K",

"The lower estimates in (37-38) hold for a given value of K",

and

"The lower estimate in (38) holds for a given value of K",

respectively.

Now note that for $K \le K'$, $L_K \subset L_{K'}$, and similarly for A_K, B_K, and D_K.

By Lemma 1.1 we get $|u|_\infty \ge C'|u|_{2,\infty}^{-1}|u|_{1,\infty}^2$ for some constant $C' > 0$. Thus, for $\tilde{K} \ge \max(C', 1)K^3$, we have $A_K \cap D_K \subset B_{\tilde{K}}$, and therefore:

$$A_K \cap D_K \subset A_{\tilde{K}} \cap B_{\tilde{K}} = L_{\tilde{K}}.$$

Consequently:

$$\rho(L_{\tilde{K}}) \ge \rho(A_K) + \rho(D_K) - 1.$$

By Theorem 3.1, Theorem 5.1, and Chebyshev's inequality, the measure of the set $A_{\tilde{K}}$ tends to T_0 as $\tilde{K}$ tends to $+\infty$. So to prove the lemma's assertion, it remains to show that there exists $C > 0$ such that for K large enough we have $\rho(D_K) \ge C$. Using the upper estimate for $\{|u|_{1,\infty}^2\}$ in Theorem 5.1, we get

$$\{|u|_{1,\infty}\mathbf{1}(|u|_{1,\infty} \ge K\nu^{-1})\} \le CK^{-1}\nu^{-1}.$$

Here, $\mathbf{1}(A)$ denotes the indicator function of an event A. On the other hand, we clearly have

$$\{|u|_{1,\infty}\mathbf{1}(|u|_{1,\infty} \le K^{-1}\nu^{-1})\} \le K^{-1}\nu^{-1}.$$

Now consider the function

$$g = |u|_{1,\infty}\mathbf{1}(K_0^{-1}\nu^{-1} \le |u|_{1,\infty} \le K_0\nu^{-1}).$$

The lower estimate for $\{|u|_{1,\infty}\}$ in Theorem 5.1 and the relations above yield

$$\{g\} \ge (C - CK_0^{-1} - K_0^{-1})\nu^{-1} \ge C_0\nu^{-1},$$

for suitable constants K_0 and C_0. Since $g \leq K_0\nu^{-1}$, we get

$$\rho(g \geq C_0\nu^{-1}/2) \geq C_0K_0^{-1}T_0/2.$$

Since $g \leq |u|_{1,\infty}$, then

$$\rho(|u|_{1,\infty} \geq C_0\nu^{-1}/2) \geq C_0K_0^{-1}T_0/2,$$

which implies the existence of $C, K_1 > 0$ such that $\rho(D_K) \geq C$ for $K \geq K_1$. $\square$

Corollary 6.5. *For $K \geq K_1$ and $\nu < K_1^{-2}$, the assertion of Lemma 6.4 with (38) replaced by*

$$K^{-1}\nu^{-1} \leq -\min u_x \leq K\nu^{-1} \tag{40}$$

still holds for the modified set O_K.

Proof. For $K = K_1$ and $\nu < K_1^{-2}$, the estimates (37-38) tell us that for $(s, \omega) \in L_K$,

$$\max u_x(s) \leq K_1 < K_1^{-1}\nu^{-1} \leq |u_x(s)|_\infty.$$

Thus, in this case the assertion of Lemma 6.4 with (38) replaced by (40) holds for the set $O_K = L_K$. Finally, we observe that since increasing K while keeping ν constant increases the measure of O_K, then the corollary's statement still holds for $K \geq K_1$ and $\nu < K_1^{-2}$. $\square$

Now we fix

$$K = K_1, \tag{41}$$

and choose

$$\nu_0 = \frac{1}{6}K^{-2};\ C_1 = \frac{1}{4}K^{-2};\ C_2 = \frac{1}{20}K^{-4}. \tag{42}$$

In particular, we have $0 < C_1\nu_0 < C_2 < 1$: thus the intervals J_i are non-empty and non-intersecting for all $\nu \in (0, \nu_0]$. Everywhere below, the constants depend on K.

Actually, we can choose any values of C_1, C_2, and ν_0, provided

$$C_1 \leq \frac{1}{4}K^{-2}; \quad 5K^2 \leq \frac{C_1}{C_2} < \frac{1}{\nu_0}.$$

Lemma 6.6. *For $\alpha \geq 0$ and $\ell \in J_1$,*

$$S_{p,\alpha}(\ell) \overset{p,\alpha}{\gtrsim} \begin{cases} \ell^{\alpha p},\ 0 \leq p \leq 1. \\ \ell^{\alpha p}\nu^{-\alpha(p-1)},\ p \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Proof. By Corollary 6.5, it suffices to prove that the inequalities hold uniformly for $(s,\omega) \in O_K$ with $S_{p,\alpha}(\ell)$ replaced by

$$\Bigl(\int_{S^1} |u(x+\ell) - u(x)|^p dx\Bigr)^{\alpha}.$$

The general case clearly follows from the case $\alpha = 1$. Till the end of the proof we assume that

$$(s,\omega) \in O_K.$$

Case $\mathbf{p \geq 1}$, $\alpha = \mathbf{1}$. Denote by z the leftmost point on S^1 (considered as $[0,1)$) such that $u'(z) \leq -K^{-1}\nu^{-1}$. Since $|u|_{2,\infty} \leq K\nu^{-2}$, we have

$$u'(y) \leq -\frac{1}{2}K^{-1}\nu^{-1}, \quad y \in [z - \frac{1}{2}K^{-2}\nu, z + \frac{1}{2}K^{-2}\nu]. \tag{43}$$

Since $\ell \leq C_1\nu = \frac{1}{4}K^{-2}\nu$, then by Hölder's inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{S^1} |u(x+\ell) - u(x)|^p dx &\geq \int_{z-\frac{1}{4}K^{-2}\nu}^{z+\frac{1}{4}K^{-2}\nu} |u(x+\ell) - u(x)|^p dx \\
&\geq (K^{-2}\nu/2)^{1-p}\Bigl(\int_{z-\frac{1}{4}K^{-2}\nu}^{z+\frac{1}{4}K^{-2}\nu} |u(x+\ell) - u(x)| dx\Bigr)^p \\
&= C(p)\nu^{1-p}\Bigl(\int_{z-\frac{1}{4}K^{-2}\nu}^{z+\frac{1}{4}K^{-2}\nu} \Bigl(\int_x^{x+\ell} -u'(y)dy\Bigr)dx\Bigr)^p \\
&\geq C(p)\nu^{1-p}\Bigl(\int_{z-\frac{1}{4}K^{-2}\nu}^{z+\frac{1}{4}K^{-2}\nu} \frac{1}{2}\ell K^{-1}\nu^{-1}\ dx\Bigr)^p = C(p)\nu^{1-p}\ell^p.
\end{aligned}$$

Case $\mathbf{p < 1}$, $\alpha = \mathbf{1}$. By Hölder's inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{S^1} |u(x+\ell) - u(x)|^p dx \geq \int_{S^1} \Bigl((u(x+\ell) - u(x))^+\Bigr)^p dx \\
&\geq \Bigl(\int_{S^1} \Bigl((u(x+\ell) - u(x))^+\Bigr)^2 dx\Bigr)^{p-1}\Bigl(\int_{S^1} (u(x+\ell) - u(x))^+ dx\Bigr)^{2-p}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the upper estimate in (37) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{S^1} |u(x+\ell) - u(x)|^p dx \\
&\geq \Bigl(\int_{S^1} \ell^2K^2 dx\Bigr)^{p-1}\Bigl(\int_{S^1} (u(x+\ell) - u(x))^+ dx\Bigr)^{2-p}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, since $\int_{S^1} (u(\cdot + \ell) - u(\cdot)) = 0$, we obtain that

$$\int_{S^1} |u(x+\ell) - u(x)|^p dx \geq C(p)\ell^{2(p-1)} \Big(\frac{1}{2} \int_{S^1} |u(x+\ell) - u(x)| dx \Big)^{2-p}$$
$$\geq C(p)\ell^p.$$

The last inequality follows from the case $p = 1,\ \alpha = 1$. $\square$

Remark 6.7. *To prove this lemma, we do not need Corollary 6.5. Indeed, in its proof we could have considered z such that $|u'(z)| \geq K^{-1}\nu^{-1}$: Lemma 6.4 guarantees its existence.*

The proof of the following lemma uses some arguments from [2]: these arguments can be made rigorous if we restrict ourselves to the set O_K.

Lemma 6.8. *For $\alpha \geq 0$ and $\ell \in J_2$,*

$$S_{p,\alpha}(\ell) \overset{p,\alpha}{\gtrsim} \begin{cases} \ell^{\alpha p}, & 0 \leq p \leq 1. \\ \ell^{\alpha}, & p \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Proof. For the same reason as in the previous proof, it suffices to prove that as long as (s,ω) belongs to O_K, the inequalities hold uniformly for $p \geq 1,\ \alpha = 1$ and for $S_{p,\alpha}(\ell)$ replaced by

$$\int_{S^1} |u(x+\ell) - u(x)|^p dx.$$

Once again, till the end of the proof we assume that $(s,\omega) \in O_K$.

Defining z in the same way as previously, we have:

$$\int_{S^1} |u(x+\ell) - u(x)|^p dx \geq$$
$$\int_{z-\frac{1}{2}\ell}^{z} \Big| \int_x^{x+\ell} u'^-(y)dy - \int_x^{x+\ell} u'^+(y)dy \Big|^p dx.$$

We have $\ell \geq C_1\nu = \frac{1}{4}K^{-2}\nu$. Thus, by (43), for $x \in [z - \frac{1}{2}\ell, z]$ we get

$$\int_x^{x+\ell} u'^-(y)dy \geq \int_z^{z+\frac{1}{8}K^{-2}\nu} u'^-(y)dy \geq \frac{1}{16}K^{-3}.$$

.

On the other hand, since $\ell \leq C_2$, then using the lower estimate in (37) we get

$$\int_x^{x+\ell} u'^+(y)dy \leq C_2 K \leq \frac{1}{20}K^{-3}.$$

Thus,

$$\int_{S^1}|u(x+\ell)-u(x)|^p dx \geq \frac{1}{2}\ell\biggl(\Bigl(\frac{1}{16}-\frac{1}{20}\Bigr)K^{-3}\biggr)^p \geq C(p)\ell. \qquad \square$$

Summing up the results above we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 6.9. *For $\alpha \geq 0$ and $\ell \in J_1$,*

$$S_{p,\alpha}(\ell) \overset{p,\alpha}{\sim} \begin{cases} \ell^{\alpha p},\ 0 \leq p \leq 1. \\ \ell^{\alpha p}\nu^{-\alpha(p-1)},\ p \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, for $\alpha \geq 0$ and $\ell \in J_2$,

$$S_{p,\alpha}(\ell) \overset{p,\alpha}{\sim} \begin{cases} \ell^{\alpha p},\ 0 \leq p \leq 1. \\ \ell^{\alpha},\ p \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

The following result follows immediately from the definition (34).

Corollary 6.10. *For $\ell \in J_2$, the flatness satisfies $F(\ell) \sim \ell^{-1}$.*

6.3. **Results in Fourier Space.** By (31), for $m \geq 1$ we have

$$\{|\hat{u}^k|^2\} \leq (2\pi k)^{-2m}\{\|u\|_m^2\} \overset{m}{\sim} (k\nu)^{-2m}\nu.$$

Thus, for $|k| \succeq \nu^{-1}$, $\{|\hat{u}^k|^2\}$ decreases super-algebraically.

Now we want to estimate the H^s norms of u for $s \in (0,1)$ (the case $s=0$ is a particular case of Theorem 5.1).

Lemma 6.11. *We have*

$$\{\|u\|_{1/2}^2\} \sim |\log \nu|.$$

Proof. By (6) we have

$$\|u\|_{1/2} \sim \biggl(\int_{S^1}\Bigl(\int_0^1 \frac{|u(x+\ell)-u(x)|^2}{\ell^2}d\ell\Bigr)dx\biggr)^{1/2}.$$

Consequently, by Fubini's theorem,

$$\begin{aligned}\{\|u\|_{1/2}^2\} &\sim \int_0^1 \frac{1}{\ell^2}\Bigl\{\int_{S^1}|u(x+\ell)-u(x)|^2dx\Bigr\}d\ell \\ &= \int_0^1 \frac{S_2(\ell)}{\ell^2}d\ell = \int_{J_1}\frac{S_2(\ell)}{\ell^2}d\ell + \int_{J_2}\frac{S_2(\ell)}{\ell^2}d\ell + \int_{J_3}\frac{S_2(\ell)}{\ell^2}d\ell.\end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 6.9 we get

$$\int_{J_1}\frac{S_2(\ell)}{\ell^2}d\ell \sim \int_0^{C_1\nu}\frac{\ell^2\nu^{-1}}{\ell^2}d\ell \sim 1$$

and

$$\int_{J_2} \frac{S_2(\ell)}{\ell^2} d\ell \sim \int_{C_1\nu}^{C_2} \frac{\ell}{\ell^2} d\ell \sim |\log \nu|,$$

respectively. Finally, by Lemma 6.2 we get

$$\int_{J_3} \frac{S_2(\ell)}{\ell^2} d\ell \leq C C_2^{-2} \leq C.$$

Thus,

$$\{\|u\|_{1/2}^2\} \sim |\log \nu|. \qquad \square$$

The proof of the following result follows the same lines.

Lemma 6.12. *For* $s \in (0, 1/2)$,

$$\{\|u\|_s^2\} \overset{s}{\sim} 1.$$

On the other hand, for $s \in (1/2, 1)$,

$$\{\|u\|_s^2\} \overset{s}{\sim} \nu^{-(2s-1)}.$$

The results above and the relation (31) tell us that $\{|\hat{u}^k|^2\}$ decreases very fast for $|k| \gtrsim \nu^{-1}$, and that for $s \geq 0$ the sums $\sum |k|^{2s}\{|\hat{u}^k|^2\}$ have exactly the same behaviour as the partial sums $\sum_{|k| \leq \nu^{-1}} |k|^{2s}|k|^{-2}$ in the limit $\nu \to 0^+$. Therefore we can conjecture that for $|k| \lesssim \nu^{-1}$, we have $\{|\hat{u}^k|^2\} \sim |k|^{-2}$.

A result of this type actually holds (after layer-averaging), as long as $|k|$ is not too small. To prove it, we use a version of the Wiener-Khinchin theorem, stating that for any function $v \in L_2$ one has

$$|v(\cdot + y) - v(\cdot)|^2 = 4 \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \sin^2(\pi n y) |\hat{v}^n|^2. \tag{44}$$

Theorem 6.13. *For* k *such that* $k^{-1} \in J_2$, *we have* $E(k) \sim k^{-2}$.

Proof. We recall that by definition (see (35)),

$$E(k) = \left\{ \frac{\sum_{|n| \in [M^{-1}k, Mk]} |\hat{u}^n|^2}{\sum_{|n| \in [M^{-1}k, Mk]} 1} \right\}.$$

Therefore proving the assertion of the theorem is the same as proving that

$$\sum_{|n| \in [M^{-1}k, Mk]} n^2 \{|\hat{u}^n|^2\} \sim k. \tag{45}$$

The upper estimate is an immediate corollary of the upper estimate for $|u|_{1,1}$ in Theorem 5.1 and holds without averaging over n such that $|n| \in [M^{-1}k, Mk]$. Indeed, integrating by parts we get

$$\{|\hat{u}^n|^2\} \leq n^{-2}\{|u_x|_1^2\} \leq Cn^{-2},$$

which proves the upper bound. Also, this inequality implies that

$$\sum_{|n|<M^{-1}k} n^2\{|\hat{u}^n|^2\} \leq CM^{-1}k \tag{46}$$

and

$$\sum_{|n|>Mk} \{|\hat{u}^n|^2\} \leq CM^{-1}k^{-1}. \tag{47}$$

To prove the lower bound we note that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{|n|\leq Mk} n^2\{|\hat{u}^n|^2\} &\geq \frac{k^2}{\pi^2} \sum_{|n|\leq Mk} \sin^2(\pi n k^{-1})\{|\hat{u}^n|^2\} \\ &\geq \frac{k^2}{\pi^2}\Big(\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} \sin^2(\pi n k^{-1})\{|\hat{u}^n|^2\} - \sum_{|n|>Mk} \{|\hat{u}^n|^2\}\Big).\end{aligned}$$

Using (44) and (47) we get

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{|n|\leq Mk} n^2\{|\hat{u}^n|^2\} &\geq \frac{k^2}{4\pi^2}\Big(\{|u(\cdot + k^{-1}) - u(\cdot)|^2\} - CM^{-1}k^{-1}\Big) \\ &\geq \frac{k^2}{4\pi^2}(S_2(k^{-1}) - CM^{-1}k^{-1}).\end{aligned}$$

Finally, using Theorem 6.9 we obtain that

$$\sum_{|n|\leq Mk} n^2\{|\hat{u}^n|^2\} \geq (C - CM^{-1})k.$$

Now we use (46) and we choose $M \geq 1$ large enough to obtain (45). $\square$

Remark 6.14. *We actually have*

$$\left\{\left(\frac{\sum_{|n|\in[M^{-1}k,Mk]} |\hat{u}^n|^2}{\sum_{|n|\in[M^{-1}k,Mk]} 1}\right)^{\alpha}\right\} \overset{\alpha}{\sim} k^{-2\alpha}, \quad \alpha > 0.$$

The upper bound is proved in the same way as previously, and then the lower bound follows from Hölder's inequality and the lower bound in Theorem 6.13.

7. Stationary Measure and Related Issues

In this section, we briefly discuss the stationary measure of (9). More details will be given in a future publication.

Since (9) is a well-posed SPDE, its solutions form a Markov process, which induces a semigroup S_t on H^1. Now consider the corresponding semigroup S_t^* acting on probability measures on H^1. A *stationary measure* is a probability measure on H^1 invariant by S_t^* for every t. A *stationary solution* is a solution $u(t,x)$ of (9) such that the law of $u(t,\cdot)$ does not depend on t, for $t \geq 0$, and thus is a stationary measure for (9).

Existence of a stationary measure for (9) is proved using the Bogolyubov-Krylov argument (see [22]).

On the other hand, for two different initial conditions the distance between the corresponding solutions of (9) in L_1 is nonincreasing. Using some additional estimates on solutions and then applying [22, Theorem 3.1.3.], we show that this contraction property implies uniqueness of the stationary measure μ. Moreover, for any u_0 the distribution of $u(t,\cdot)$ converges to μ as $t \to +\infty$, uniformly in u_0. In particular, μ is supported in C^∞.

Estimates in the previous sections hold, in particular, for a stationary solution of (9). Indeed, it suffices to consider an initial condition u_0 with distribution μ. It follows that those estimates still hold when averaging in time and in ensemble (denoted by $\{\cdot\}$) is replaced by averaging solely in ensemble. That is, by integrating with respect to μ. Namely, Theorem 5.1, Theorem 6.9, and Theorem 6.13 imply, respectively, the following results.

Theorem 7.1. *For $m \in \{0,1\}$ and $p \in [1,\infty]$, or for $m \geq 2$ and $p \in (1,\infty]$,*

$$\Big(\int |u|_{m,p}^{\alpha}\, d\mu(u) \Big)^{1/\alpha} \overset{m,p,\alpha}{\sim} \nu^{-\gamma}, \quad \alpha > 0.$$

Theorem 7.2. *For $\alpha \geq 0$ and $\ell \in J_1$,*

$$\int \Big(\int_{S^1} |u(x+\ell) - u(x)|^p dx \Big)^{\alpha} d\mu(u) \overset{p,\alpha}{\sim} \begin{cases} \ell^{\alpha p}, \ 0 \leq p \leq 1. \\ \ell^{\alpha p} \nu^{-\alpha(p-1)}, \ p \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, for $\alpha \geq 0$ and $\ell \in J_2$,

$$\int \Big(\int_{S^1} |u(x+\ell) - u(x)|^p dx \Big)^{\alpha} d\mu(u) \overset{p,\alpha}{\sim} \begin{cases} \ell^{\alpha p}, \ 0 \leq p \leq 1. \\ \ell^{\alpha}, \ p \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 7.3. *For k such that $k^{-1} \in J_2$, we have:*

$$\int \frac{\sum_{|n| \in [M^{-1}k, Mk]} |\hat{u}^n|^2}{\sum_{|n| \in [M^{-1}k, Mk]} 1} d\mu(u) \sim k^{-2}.$$

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my Ph.D. advisor S.Kuksin for formulation of the problem, advice, and guidance. I am also very grateful to A.Biryuk, U.Frisch, and K.Khanin for helpful discussions. Finally, I would like to thank all of the staff and faculty at the CMLS in Ecole Polytechnique for advice and support.

References

[1] R. A. Adams, *Sobolev Spaces*, Academic Press, New-York-London, 1975.

[2] E. Aurell, U. Frisch, J. Lutsko, M. Vergassola, *On the Multifractal Properties of the Energy Dissipation Derived from Turbulence Data*, Journal of Fluid Mechanics 238, 1992, 467-486.

[3] J. Bec, U. Frisch, *"Burgulence"*, Les Houches 2000: New Trends in Turbulence; M. Lesieur, A.Yaglom and F. David, eds., pp. 341-383, Springer EDP-Sciences, 2001.

[4] J. Bec, K. Khanin, *Burgers Turbulence*, Physics Reports 447 (2007), 1-66.

[5] A. Biryuk, *Spectral Properties of Solutions of the Burgers Equation with Small Dissipation*, Functional Analysis and its Applications, 35:1 (2001), 1-12.

[6] A. Boritchev, *Estimates for Solutions of a Low-Viscosity Kick-Forced Generalised Burgers Equation*, Preprint (to appear in Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh A), arXiv:1107.4866v1.

[7] J. M. Burgers, *The Nonlinear Diffusion Equation: Asymptotic Solutions and Statistical Problems*, Reidel Publishing Company, Lecture Series (University of Maryland, Institute for Fluid Dynamics and Applied Mathematics), no. 52, 1974.

[8] A. Chorin, *Lectures on Turbulence Theory*, Publish or Perish, Mathematics Lecture Series, vol.5, 1975.

[9] G. Da Prato, J. Zabczyk, *Stochastic Equations in Infinite Dimensions*, Encyclopaedia of Mathematics and its Applications vol. 45, Cambridge University Press, 1992.

[10] G. Da Prato, J. Zabczyk, *Ergodicity for Infinite Dimensional Systems*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Notes, Cambridge University Press, 1996.

[11] C. Doering, J. D. Gibbon, *Applied Analysis of the Navier-Stokes Equations*, Cambridge Texts in Applied Mathematics, Cambridge University Press, 1995.

[12] Weinan E, K. Khanin, A. Mazel, Ya. Sinai, *Probability Distribution Functions for the Random Forced Burgers Equation*, Physical Review Letters 78(10), 1997, 1904-1907.

[13] Weinan E, K. Khanin, A. Mazel, Ya. Sinai, *Invariant Measures for Burgers Equation with Stochastic Forcing*, Annals of Mathematics 151 (2000), 877-960.

[14] U. Frisch, *Turbulence: The Legacy of A.N. Kolmogorov*, Cambridge University Press, 1995.

[15] D. Gomes, R. Iturriaga, K. Khanin, P. Padilla, *Viscosity Limit of Stationary Distributions for the Random Forced Burgers Equation*, Moscow Mathematical Journal 5 (2005), 613-631.

[16] R. Iturriaga, K. Khanin, *Burgers Turbulence and Random Lagrangian Systems*, Communications in Mathematical Physics 232 (3), 2003, 377-428.

[17] S. Kida, *Asymptotic Properties of Burgers Turbulence*, Journal of Fluid Mechanics, 93 (1979), no.2, 337-377.

[18] R. H. Kraichnan, *Lagrangian-History Statistical Theory for Burgers' Equation*, Physics of Fluids 11(2), 1968, 265-277.

[19] S. N. Kruzkov, *The Cauchy Problem in the Large for Nonlinear Equations and for Certain Quasilinear Systems of the First-Order with Several Variables*, Soviet Mathematics - Doklady, 5 (1964), 493-496.

[20] S. Kuksin, *On Turbulence in Nonlinear Schrödinger Equations*, Geometric and Functional Analysis, 1997, vol. 7, 783-822.

[21] S. Kuksin, *Spectral Properties of Solutions for Nonlinear PDEs in the Turbulent Regime*, Geometric and Functional Analysis, 1999, vol. 9, 141-184.

[22] S. Kuksin, A. Shirikyan, *Mathematics of Two-Dimensional Turbulence*, Cambridge University Press, To appear, Preliminary version on http://www.math.polytechnique.fr/∼kuksin/MyBooks/bookArmen.pdf.

[23] Hui-Hsiung Kuo, *Gaussian Measures in Banach Spaces*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 463. Springer, 1975

[24] H. P. McKean, *Stochastic Integrals*, Academic Press, New York, 1969.

[25] M. Taylor, *Partial Differential Equations I: Basic Theory*, Applied Mathematical Sciences vol. 115, Springer, 1996.